

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/605,826	10/29/2003	James C. Kennedy	67286-278	2825	
22428	7590 06/30/2006		EXAMINER		
FOLEY ANI	LARDNER LLP		BADIO, BARBARA P		
SUITE 500 3000 K STRE	ET NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	ON, DC 20007		1617		
			DATE MAILED: 06/30/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			Application N	0.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary			10/605,826		KENNEDY ET AL.				
			Examiner		Art Unit				
			Barbara P. Ba		1617				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	nication appo	ears on the co	er sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	Idress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MISSIONS OF THE MISSIO	MAILING DA s of 37 CFR 1.13 munication. tatutory period wi y will, by statute,	ATE OF THIS (66(a). In no event, he rill apply and will exp cause the applicatio	COMMUNICATION between, may a reply be time ine SIX (6) MONTHS from in to become ABANDONEI	I. lely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status									
1)	Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on	•						
· · ·	* *	-	- action is non-f	inal.					
3)□	, _								
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.									
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the	application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>2</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1,3,5,6 and 11-21</u> is/are re	ejected.							
7)⊠	7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>4 and 7-10</u> is/are objected to.								
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or	election requi	rement.					
Applicati	on Papers								
9)	The specification is objected to by the	ne Examiner	r.						
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11)	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:								
	1. Certified copies of the priority								
	2. Certified copies of the priority			• •		01			
	 Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation 	· ·	•		o in this National	Stage			
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action		•	· · · ·	d				
	so the attached detailed office detail		or the contined	copies not receive	u.				
Attachmen	t(s)								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) [Interview Summary					
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (_	Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal Page 1	ite	D 152)			
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 o r No(s)/Mail Date	1 1 1 0/28/08)		Other:	ателі Аррікайон (РТС	J-1J2)			

Art Unit: 1617

Nonfinal Office Action on the Merits

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Status of the Application

2. Claims 1-21 are pending in the present application. Claim 2 stands withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a nonelected invention.

Double Patenting

3. The rejections of claims 1 and 3-21 under the judicially created double patenting over claims 1-12 of US Patent 6,710,066, claims 1-12 of US Patent 5,955,490 and claims 1-2 of US Patent 5,211,938 are maintained. Applicant's statement that a terminal disclaimer will be filed upon indication of allowable subject matter is noted.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 7-10 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 7-10 have not been further treated on the merits.

Art Unit: 1617

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1, 3, 6 and 11-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The court has held that an adequate written description requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name or physical properties, "not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention." *Eli Lilly*, 119, F.3d 1559, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The Federal Circuit has also adopted the standard set forth in the Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO") Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 USC 112, 1 "Written Description" Requirement ("Guidelines"), 66 Fed. Reg. 1099 (Jan. 5, 2001), which state that the written description requirement can be met by "showing that an invention is complete by disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristics, "including, inter alia, "functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure...". *Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe.*, 296 F.3d, 316, 1324-25 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

Art Unit: 1617

The present specification lacks an adequate description of the claimed subject matter because there is insufficient descriptive support for the phrase "a precursor of protoporphyrin IX". The present specification lacks any correlation between said functional characteristic and any structure and, thus, the skilled artisan would be unable to envision the compounds necessary for practice of the claimed invention. Thus, the claims fail to comply with the written description requirement.

7. Claims 1, 3, 6 and 11-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for 5-aminolevulinic acid, does not reasonably provide enablement for precursors of protoporphyrin IX. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 USC 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Among these factors are (1) the nature of the invention, (2) the breadth of the claims, (3) the state of the prior art, (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, (5) the amount of guidance or direction presented, (6) the presence or absence of working examples, (7) the relative skill in the art and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary. When the above factors are taken into consideration, the examiner's position is that one skilled in the art could not perform the invention commensurate in scope with the instant claim without undue experimentation.

Art Unit: 1617

The instant claims recite the utilization of "a precursor of protoporphyrin IX" and, thus, encompass the utilization of all compounds, known or unknown, which might be a precursor of protoporphyrin IX. However, the present specification lacks guidance or working examples of other compounds, apart from 5-aminolevulinic acid, which are precursors of protoporphyrin IX. Therefore, in order to practice the claimed invention commensurate in scope of the instant claims, the skilled artisan in art would first have to search the prior art and test every compound, known and unknown, for its effect on the production of protoporphyrin IX. Because of the lack of guidance or working examples of other compounds which are precursors of protoporphyrin IX and, thus, that would fall within the scope of claimed invention, the experimentation necessary to practice the claimed invention is undue.

- 8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 9. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6 and 11-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The instant claims are indefinite for the following reasons:

Claim 1 recites the administration of "an effective amount of a precursor of protoporphyrin IX" but lacks structural identification of compounds encompassed by said phrase, thus, the metes and bound of the claimed invention is indefinite.

Art Unit: 1617

Claim 5 recites a "method of treating a non-malignant skin lesion in a human patient in which protoporphyrin IX is produced from 5-aminolevulinic acid, comprising exposing said skin lesion....". It is unclear what is being administered. Is the treatment by exposing the skin lesion to light or is it due to administration of 5-aminolevulinic acid?

Claim 6 is dependent on itself and, thus, is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 10. The rejection of claims 1 and 3-21 under 35 USC 102(b) over Richter et al. (US 5,705,518) is withdrawn.
- 11. The rejection of claims 1, 6-16 and 18-21 under 35 USC 102(b) over Bommer et al. (US 4,977,177) is withdrawn.
- 12. The rejection of claims 1 and 4-21 under 35 USC 102(b) over Divaris et al. (American Journal of Pathology, 1990) is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 13. The rejection of claims 1 and 3-21 under 35 USC 103(a) over Richter et al. (US 5,705,518) in view of Bommer et al. (US 4,977,177) is withdrawn.
- 14. The rejection of claims 1 and 3-21 under 35 USC 103(a) over Pandey (US 5,093,349) is withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

15. Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Telephone Inquiry

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara P. Badio, Ph.D. whose telephone number is

571-272-0609. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is

571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Parkara Madio Barbara P. Badio, Ph.D.

Page 7

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1617

BB

June 26, 2006